



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,724	09/30/2003	Vibhu Mittal	16113-1300001	2943
26192 7590 03/24/2011 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
CHEN, TE Y				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2161				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/24/2011		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/676,724

**Applicant(s)**

MITTAL ET AL.

**Examiner**

SUSAN Y. CHEN

**Art Unit**

2161

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-21 and 46-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 62 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-21 and 46-61 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-945)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on January 25, 2011.

Claims 14-21 and 46-62, are pending for examination; claims 14-15, 46-47 and 54- 55 have been amended; claims 1-13 and 22-45 have been canceled; claims 62 has been withdrawn for consideration.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 14-21 and 46-61, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,593 issued to Hargrave et al. (hereinafter referred as Hargrave).

Claim 14:

Hargrave discloses the claimed search method [e.g., Abstract], comprising:  
receiving a search query including one or more terms, each term written in a first format from a user device [e.g., a translation memory (TM) of a general purpose

personal computer device such as a IBM Personal Computer (e.g., col. 5, lines 22-26) which receives a user search query entered (e.g., step 903, Fig. 9) in a specific computer-readable source language format including one or more terms (e.g., one or more tokenized query terms, 905, Fig. 9)];

translating the one or more terms of the query into a group of translated queries, each translated query having one or more terms in a second format using a probabilistic dictionary, the probabilistic dictionary mapping terms from the first format to the second format [e.g., per the software of Translation Memory (TM) system of Fig. 9 which tokenizes, weights and normalizes the source query text input format into a second translated query vector format (e.g., the steps 905-907, Fig. 9) using a probabilistic dictionary (e.g., per 403, 405, 407, 408 of Fig.(s) 5-8 and associated texts), the probabilistic dictionary mapping terms from the first source query text format to the second vector format];

using a search engine to identify a plurality of documents written in the second format that are responsive to the group of translated search queries [e.g., Unlike the conventional word search engine (e.g., col. 3, lines 1 – 13), the TM translator search engine used an aligned file (or aligned pairs file as shown by the unit: 403, Fig. 5) and a created inverted index table to identify a plurality of documents responsive to the group of translated search queries (e.g., col. 5, lines 10-22 & col. 11, lines 6 – 36 & Fig. 3) for quickly searching (i.e. finding and retrieving) of all text segment segments in the aligned pair file (e.g., 403, Fig. 5) similar to the text of one or more translated queries (col. 13, lines 7 – 19, Fig. 9 and associated texts). Wherein the plurality of documents were

written in a text segment vector format (e.g., Fig. 2 and associated texts) and It is intended that the text segment vectors provide a basis for searching the source text file in response to a query. (e.g., col. 9, lines 66-67)] and

providing search results written in the second format to the user device, the search results referencing one or more of the identified documents [e.g., per the similarity retrieval and indexing file processing techniques at col. 13, lines 7 – 19 and Fig. 9 including associated texts].

Claim 15:

Except the limitations recited in claim 14, Hargrave further discloses:

obtaining search result selections from the user device [e.g., the steps: 903-907, Fig. 9 and associated texts];

using said search result selections to modify the probabilistic dictionary of term mappings [e.g., col. 13, lines 20 – 57, the steps: 903-913, Fig. 9 and associated texts].

Claim 16:

Except the limitations recited in claim 15, Hargrave further discloses the modification comprises adjusting at least one probability associated with at least one mapping in the probabilistic dictionary [e.g., col. 5, lines 1-9, Fig. 9 and associated texts].

Claim 17:

Except the limitations recited in claim 14, Hargrave further discloses where translating the query into the second format includes expanding the search query [e.g., the adding and linking back schema at col. 12, lines 26- col. 13, lines 6, col. 13, lines 41 – col. 14, lines 8].

Claim 18:

Except the limitations recited in claim 17, Hargrave further discloses the expanded query includes alternative encodings of the search query terms [e.g., col. 14, lines 1-16].

Claim 19:

Except the limitations recited in claim 17, Hargrave further discloses the expanded query includes alternative language translations of the search query terms [e.g., col. 14, lines 16-17].

Claim 20:

Except the limitations recited in claim 17, Hargrave further discloses the expanded search query includes alternative encodings and alternative language translations of the search query terms [e.g., col. 14, lines 1-17].

Claim 21:

Except the limitations recited in claim 18, Hargrave further disclose the expanded search query includes synonyms of the alternative encodings of the search query terms [e.g., col. 2, lines 38-67, col. 14, lines 1-17].

As to claims 46 – 61, these claims recite similar features as claims 14 – 21 in form of computer system and storage medium encoded with a computer program, hence are rejected for the same reason.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on June 15, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner disagrees with applicant's arguments and piece-meal interpretations of the prior art of Hargrave.

Applicant argued that Hargrave does not describe "a search query including one or more terms, each term written in a first format..., translating the one or more terms of the search query into a group of translated search queries, each translated search query having one or more terms in a second format..., using a search engine to identify a plurality of documents written in the second format in which the plurality of documents are responsive to the group of translated search queries," as recited in amended claim 14".

In reply to the above arguments, the examiner first noted that applicant failed to define the metes and bounds of the claimed one or more terms, thus, the claimed subject matters are widely open for prior art interpretations.

Further, Hargrave clearly disclosed a translation memory (TM) of a general purpose computer device such as a IBM Personal Computer (e.g., col. 5, lines 22-24) that receives a user submitted search query (e.g., step 903, Fig. 9) in a specific text source query language format including one or more terms (e.g., one or more tokenized query terms, 905, Fig. 9) to translate the one or more terms of the search query into a group of translated search queries in a second text segment vector format(e.g., 905-907, Fig. 9) using a probabilistic dictionary (e.g., per units: 403, 405, 407, 408 of Fig.(s) 5-8 and associated texts), the probabilistic dictionary mapping terms from the first source query text format (e.g., 403, Fig. 5) to the second vector format (e.g., 409, Fig. 8).

Hargrave further disclosed that unlike the conventional word search engine (e.g., col. 3, lines 1 – 13), a TM translator search engine uses an aligned file (or aligned pairs file as shown by the unit: 403, Fig. 5) and a created inverted index table to identify a plurality of documents responsive to the group of translated search queries (e.g., col. 5, lines 10-22 & col. 11, lines 6 – 36 & Fig. 3) for quickly searching (i.e. finding and retrieving) of all text segment segments in the aligned pair file (e.g., 403, Fig. 5) similar to the text of one or more translated queries (e.g., 907, 909, 911, 912, 913, 915 & 917, etc., Fig. 9 and associated texts). Wherein the plurality of documents were written in the



second text segment vector format (e.g., Fig. 2 and associated texts) and It is intended that the second text segment vectors provide a basis for searching the source text file in response to a query (e.g., col. 9, lines 66-67).

Moreover, Hargrave clearly disclosed his computer system provides search results written in the second vector format to the user device, the search results referencing one or more of the identified documents by using the TM similarity retrieval and indexing file processing techniques at Fig. 9 and associated texts.

Thus, in contrary to applicant's arguments, Hargrave clearly anticipated the limitations recited in claim 14.

As to the rest of arguments which merely rehashed issues addressed on record.

Based on the discussion above, because applicant does not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references and rejections, therefore, it is believed that the rejections on record should be sustained.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Points of Contact***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUSAN Y. CHEN whose telephone number is (571)272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mofiz Apu can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Susan Y Chen/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2161

March 17, 2011